

REMARKS

The final Office Action dated 31 December 2007 has been received and its contents carefully studied. The pending claims are claims 1-4 and 6-27. All claims stand rejected.

The pending independent claims are method claim 1, interface claim 11, mobile phone claim 19, PDA claim 21, program claim 22, storage medium claim 24, and mobile phone claim 26.

At page 3 of the final Office Action, all claims are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Inoue et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,332,024). The Office Action asserts that *Inoue* discloses all the limitations of each of the claims. The previous objections to claims 24-25, and also the rejections of claims 22-23 under 35 USC § 101, have been withdrawn.

The present independent claims are now amended without prejudice, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application. All of the amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed, and introduce no new matter.

Brief Summary of Invention

The present invention provides a method for displaying a menu on a display. This method includes activating a selection element, which causes a magnified version of the activated selection to appear, and also causes auxiliary elements to be displayed only in the active selection element.

The auxiliary elements include a directional indicator, and activating the directional indicator activates a different selection element. When the new selection element is activated, the auxiliary elements are no longer displayed in the selection element that was initially active, and instead auxiliary elements (including directional indicators) are displayed in the new selection element. This technique greatly facilitates navigation from one task to another.

Brief Summary of the Cited Inoue Reference

The portable terminal of *Inoue* has a display screen and also has a main “soft key” which can be rotated and which can also be pressed. The terminal additionally has a first auxiliary soft key and second auxiliary soft key, which can both be pressed. In this portable terminal of *Inoue*, for each communication mode, a function having the highest frequency of use is allocated to the main soft key, and functions having the next highest frequency of use are allocated to the first

auxiliary soft key and second auxiliary soft key. Marks representing the allocated functions are displayed on the display screen near these three keys, as a main-function icon and auxiliary-function icon.

Further Remarks

The final Office Action includes a “Response to Arguments” beginning at page 6 of the Office Action. While Applicants believe that the present claim amendments very clearly distinguish the present claimed invention from *Inoue* even if the “Response to Arguments” is correct, nevertheless Applicants also respectfully submit that the “Response to Arguments” is not correct.

The Office Action is incorrect to assert that magnifying and highlighting are similar actions. The Office Action says at page 7 that “‘ENTER’ is magnified by enlarging its size in figure 6B.” But there is no enlargement of size in figure 6B of *Inoue*. The “ENTER” button is the same size in figure 6B as it is in figures 6A, 6C, 6G, and 6D of *Inoue*. As far as applicant can determine, *Inoue* does not teach or suggest magnifying a selection element. Magnifying and highlighting are not the same, despite what is said in the last sentence on page 2 of the Office Action..

To magnify means to increase the apparent size of an object. Although magnifying may cause text or icons to be displayed in a manner intended to emphasize their selection, magnifying and highlighting are not synonymous. In this context, magnifying imposes a limitation not satisfied by mere highlighting, because *Inoue* does not suggest increasing the size of the active selection element. As is clearly shown in all figures of the instant application, magnification (in the context of the present invention) relates to increasing the size of an active selection element, such as the envelope in the tool bar 1, which is enlarged below tool bar 1. Should the meaning of “magnify” remain unclear, page 4, lines 5-10 of the application as originally filed further describes what is meant by the term. *Inoue*, in contrast, does not teach or suggest increasing the size of a selection element, or magnification of anything in any capacity.

In any event, the additional features now introduced by the present claim amendments provide further distinguishing features as compared to *Inoue*. Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early allowance.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is respectfully believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §102 based on *Inoue* be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicant's attorney asks that the Examiner please call to discuss the present response by telephone, if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 14, 2008

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER
SLUYS & ADOLPHSON LLP
Building Five, Bradford Green
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955

Andrew T. Hyman
Andrew T. Hyman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,858